



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,586	05/24/2002	Hans Lander	10191/2175	6461

26646 7590 02/25/2004

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

HWU, DAVIS D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/030,586

Applicant(s)

LANDER ET AL.

Examiner

Davis Hwu

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16, 19, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. in view of Rhoades.

The patent to Nally et al. discloses a fuel injector for an internal combustion engine having an externally supplied ignition, the fuel injector comprising a fuel inlet 56, a movable valve closure member 24, a fixed valve seat 40 as recited, and a downstream valve end including a component 41 and a fuel outlet, wherein the fuel outlet includes at least one discharge orifice of the component since the component 41 is an orifice disk, and the at least one discharge is arranged downstream of the fixed valve seat (see Figure 1). Nally et al. do not disclose the component including a coating as recited. The patent to Rhoades teaches a method of making a fuel injector in which the fuel injector comprises discharge orifices which are coated with PTFE which contains fluorine in order to attain precise flow resistance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Nally et al. by providing a coating comprising PTFE around the at least one discharge orifice as taught by Rhoades in order to attain precise flow resistance. The method of coating a surface via spraying as recited in claim 24 is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 3752

3. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. in view of Rhoades as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Fedorovich et al.

The patent of Fedorovich et al. teaches coating internal combustion engines with fluorosilicate to improve heat resistance of the various surfaces of the engines. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Nally et al. and Rhoades by providing a coating comprising fluorosilicate as taught by Fedorovich et al. in order to provide heat resistance.

4. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. in view of Rhoades as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Otomo et al.

The patent of Otomo et al. teaches coating gaskets with heat and corrosion resistant PTFE. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Nally et al. and Rhoades by providing coating comprising PTFE as taught by Otomo et al. to resist heat and corrosion of the discharge orifice.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nally et al. in view of Rhoades as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Komaroff et al.

The patent of Komaroff et al. teaches an internal combustion comprising an auto-ignition in which the auto-ignition is known to prevent the problem of having to convert time variables into angle variables as required in a spark-ignition engine.

Art Unit: 3752

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Nally et al. and Rhoades by providing the engine with an auto-ignition as taught by Komaroff et al. to prevent the problem of having to convert time variables into angle variables as required in a spark-ignition engine.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Fleming et al., Potter et al., and Matsumoto et al. are pertinent to Applicant's invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davis Hwu whose telephone number is 703-305-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on (703)308-2087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0861.



Davis Hwu